perspective image object." Additionally, the Office Action alleges that "texture mapping is performed on objects as discussed above and shown in Figs. 22A, 22B." Applicant disagrees.

These assertions do not address the claim language that the intermediate buffer drawing section temporarily draws an "image of a geometry-processed object in an intermediate buffer" or that a geometry-processing section performs "perspective transformation on an object set in an object space specified in a three-dimensional space" as recited in each of independent claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, 19 and 23-26. Thus, although the final image in the frame buffer may have spatial depth, there is no teaching in Ghosh that the objects drawn in the alleged intermediate buffers are perspectively transformed. That is, Ghosh merely selects between a foreground image and a background image and performs no three-dimensional calculations to perform geometry processing for perspective transformation.

For example, in Applicants' specification, this geometric processing is based on the location of the object in three-dimensional space relative to a virtual camera location. However, by the Examiner's own admissions, the images in Ghosh are two-dimensional images. Thus, there can be no perspective transformation of a two-dimensional image.

Accordingly, because each and every feature of independent claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, 19 and 23-26 is not taught in Ghosh, these claims and claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Ghosh.

Moreover, with respect to independent claims 1, 10, and 19, the claims require drawing a primitive based on drawing positions "specified based on three-dimensional information associated with a position of the object in the object space." The Office Action relies on Figs. 22A and 22B and col. 18, lines 37-48 for this feature. However, this passage merely allows swapping of object packets to reverse the order of the overlay. Because the

images are two-dimensional images, as admitted, drawing positions are not based on three-dimensional information. Thus, for these additional reasons, Ghosh fails to anticipate claims 1, 10, or 19 or claims dependent therefrom.

With respect to independent claims 5, 14, and 23, the claims require an "image effect section which performs a given image effect processing on the image on the intermediate buffer before the image drawn in the intermediate buffer is drawn in the frame buffer." The passage relied upon in Ghosh (col. 15, line 58 to col. 16, line 14) merely allows selection of the foreground or background image. This does not perform a given effect processing on the image prior to the image being drawn in the frame buffer, but instead, merely defines the order of display in the frame buffer. Thus, for these additional reasons, Ghosh fails to anticipate claims 5, 14, or 23 or claims dependent therefrom.

With respect to independent claims 6, 15, and 24, the claims require an "image synthesizing section which synthesizes an image drawn in the intermediate buffer at a present frame with an other image drawn in the intermediate buffer at a past frame before the image drawn in the intermediate buffer is drawn in the frame buffer." The passage relied upon in Ghosh (col.15, line 58 to col. 16, line 14) merely discloses foreground and background storage means 610, 620 and selector means 630 for selectively providing output of either foreground or background video data. No images are synthesized prior to being drawn in the frame buffer. Thus, for these additional reasons, Ghosh fails to anticipate claims 6, 15, or 24 or claims dependent therefrom.

With respect to independent claims 7, 16, and 25, the claims require an "image synthesizing section which synthesizes an image drawn in the intermediate buffer with another image drawn in the frame buffer before the image drawn in the intermediate buffer is drawn in the frame buffer." As discussed above, the passage relied upon in Ghosh (col. 15, line 58 to col. 16, line 14) merely stores two images and selectively outputs one of them for

use in the frame buffer. No images are synthesized prior to being drawn in the frame buffer. Thus, for these additional reasons, Ghosh fails to anticipate claims 7, 16, or 25 or claims dependent therefrom.

With respect to independent claims 8, 17, and 26, the claims require that "the intermediate buffer drawing section draws the image of the geometry-processed object in the intermediate buffer for each two-frame or each M-frame (M≥3)." The passage relied upon in Ghosh (col. 5, lines 5-10) merely states that a double line buffer comprises a foreground generator 10 and a background generator 12. There is no teaching of drawing a discrete number of frames as discussed in Applicants' Fig. 11 embodiment. Thus, for these additional reasons, Ghosh fails to anticipate claims 8, 17, or 26 or claims dependent therefrom.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Joel S. Armstrong
Registration No. 36,430

JAO:SPC/lah

Date: July 23, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461